

REMARKS

The specification has a minor addition at page 5, of form and not of substance, and is therefore not new matter.

The claims are now found on a separate sheet.

As to the rejection of Cheiky in view of Scher, the Examiner is in error, because the Cheiky patent shows a layer only in one side of the anode material. Layer 16 is an oil, an easily removeable, nonpermanent film. It is inappropriate to equate a polymer which is a permanent layer for an oil film, especially when they are used for two different purposes. Nothing in either reference teaches hermitically sealing the sodium within the tape and such could never transpire in an oil layer.

The addition of Watanabe doesn't solve the problem, as the product of applicant is not intended to be roll wound, but rather fed through continuously. There is a difference between class 1 conductor and a class 2 conductor. Applicant is class 1. f

If there are any issues unseen by counsel, the Examiner is urged to contact him in California at 916-485-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark C. Jacobs', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark C. Jacobs, 24043

Attorney for Applicant(s)

sactopat@aol.com